

## **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figure 1, replaces the original sheet including Figure 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 1/4 (Figure 1)

## REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed October 17, 2006. By the present amendment, claims 1-24 remain pending in the application. Claims 25-29 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 30-37 were previously withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement.

## OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Figure 1 was objected to as not being labeled "Prior Art". A Replacement Drawing sheet including the legend "Prior Art" is being submitted herewith. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B):

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-13, 17-19 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the EDO 3000 Series Rugged Laptop and Docking Station disclosure (hereinafter the "EDO 3000 Reference"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, it will be noted that independent claim 1 has been amended to more positively recite a retrofittable system that provides a Man-In-The-Loop (MITL) weapon control capability to a non-MITL mobile platform. Additional amendments to claim 1 are directed to the circuit having an MITL interface on the mobile platform, and in which the circuit operates independently of other weapon systems carried on the mobile platform. The EDO 3000 Reference does not disclose or suggest claim 1 as it now stands amended. The EDO 3000 Reference is directed to a Pentium III personal computer that

is adapted to be used with a particular style of docking station. This reference does not disclose or suggest a system which is retrofittable to a mobile platform to implement a Man-In-The-Loop weapon control capability to a non-MITL mobile platform, nor does it suggest or disclose using first and second data ports for communicating information through a data link, and where one of the data ports operates to accept imaging data from the weapon itself. At most, the EDO 3000 Reference can fairly be viewed as disclosing a specialized type of portable or laptop computer that may be slightly better suited for military applications where rugged or demanding conditions are to be expected. There is certainly no suggestion or disclosure, however, in the EDO 3000 Reference on how to implement such a computer as a retrofittable component on a mobile platform to implement MITL weapon capability on a non-MITL mobile platform. For at least this reason, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the EDO 3000 Reference is most respectfully requested.

The present application is directed to a Man-In-The-Loop weapon system for controlling a MITL weapon via a MIL-STD-1760 store interface. Accordingly, such a system uses unique power and control sequencing, the MITL compatible data link and protocol that supports the transmission of data and video signals to and from a data link pod associated with the MITL weapon. In-flight video and control of a SLAM-ER missile requires even further control capability than that required by other types of missile launch systems. Independent claims 1 and 13, as the Examiner will note, now specifically call out the MITL interface implemented by the circuit (claim 1) or the computer (claim 13), in addition to the ports for transmitting commands and imaging information between the weapon and the circuit or computer.

Claims 25-27 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,755,372 to Menzel (hereinafter "Menzel"). The Examiner will note that claims 25-29 have been canceled without prejudice.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)**

Claims 2-4, 8, 14-16 and 20 were rejected as being obvious over the EDO 3000 Reference, together with the Examiner's taking of official notice that video digitizers and joysticks are well known in the art for converting analog video signals into digital signals and for playing video games, respectfully. In view of the amendments made to independent claims 1 and 13, it is believed that the rejection of these dependent claims has been rendered moot.

Claims 28 and 29 were rejected as being obvious over Menzel in view of the Examiner's taking of official notice, as described above. Since these two claims have been canceled, it is believed that this rejection has also been rendered moot.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Jan. 17, 2007

By:   
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDE/dyw